Public Meeting 2: Evaluation Criteria Tables November 14, 2013

Evaluation Criteria Methodology

The following tables show how the preliminary mobility and development framework approaches were evaluated.

Mobility Approaches

The evaluation of the Mobility Approaches includes Traffic Operations, Access Control, Beverly Intersection Improvements, and Non-motorized Improvements.

Traffic Operations

Table 1: Level of Service (LOS) for Northbound Stockton Hill Road Segments.

	LOS*								
		AM		Mi	dday		1	PM	
Segment - Stockton Hill Road NB	Existing	Optimized	k	Existing	Optir	nized	Existing	Optin	nized
Detroit - I-40 EB	E	D	+	D	С	+	С	С	
I-40 EB - I-40 WB	С	С		С	С		С	С	
I-40 WB - KRMC	С	С		D	С	+	D	В	+
KRMC - Sycamore	D	С	+	D	С	+	D	D	
Sycamore - Airway	E	E		E	F	-	E	F	-
Airway - Kino	В	В		В	В		В	В	
Kino - Home Depot	В	В		С	С		В	В	
Home Depot - Gordon	В	В		В	В		В	В	
Gordon - Northern	Α	А		Α	Α		Α	Α	
Corridor	С	В	+	С	С		С	С	

^{*}Segment LOS measures include +/- if applicable





Table 2: Level of Service (LOS) for Southbound Stockton Hill Road Segments

Segment -	LOS*								
Stockton Hill	E Saltan	AM			lidday		E Coltan	PM	
Road NB	Existing	Optimize	ea	Existing	Optimize	ea	Existing	Optimize	ea
Detroit - I-40 EB	Α	Α		Α	Α		Α	А	
I-40 EB - I-40 WB	В	В		В	В		В	В	
I-40 WB - KRMC	В	В		С	С		В	В	
KRMC - Sycamore	С	С		С	С		С	С	
Sycamore - Airway	С	В	+	С	В	+	С	В	+
Airway - Kino	С	В	+	D	С	+	С	D	-
Kino - Home Depot	С	С		С	D	-	D	С	+
Home Depot - Gordon	В	В		В	В		В	В	
Gordon - Northern	С	С		В	В		С	В	+
Corridor	В	В		В	В		В	В	

^{*}Segment LOS measures include +/- if applicable

Table 3: Speed for Northbound Stockton Hill Road Segments

Segment -	SPEED* (MPH)								
Stockton Hill		AM		N	lidday		PM		
Road NB	Existing	Optimize	d	Existing	Optimize	d	Existing	Optimize	ed
Detroit - I-40 EB	12.7	14.5	+	17	18	+	18.1	18.7	+
I-40 EB - I-40 WB	18.3	18	-	20.7	20.7		21.7	21.6	
I-40 WB - KRMC	21.6	19.3	-	16.8	21.1	+	17	24	+
KRMC - Sycamore	14.1	22.6	+	14.8	20.5	+	16.9	16.6	_
Sycamore - Airway	13.5	12.8	-	10.7	9.6	-	13.8	9	-
Airway - Kino	25.7	29.4	+	27.9	29.6	+	24.7	29.6	+
Kino - Home Depot	26.2	25.5	-	18.9	23.6	+	25.8	24.7	-
Home Depot - Gordon	28.3	28.5	+	26.5	28.9	+	27.2	28	+
Gordon - Northern	34	33.8	-	33.8	34.3	+	33.4	34.5	+
Corridor	23.1	24.3	+	22.6	23.8	+	23.5	23.5	

^{*}Segment speed measures include +/- if applicable





Table 4: Speed for Southbound Stockton Hill Road Segments

Segment -	SPEED* (MPH)								
Stockton Hill	Д	M		Mic	dday		P	PM	
Road NB	Existing	Optimize	d	Existing	Optimize	ed	Existing	Optimize	ed
Detroit - I-40 EB	32.4	32.4		32	33.7	+	31.6	32.6	+
I-40 EB - I-40 WB	24.5	27.6	+	24.8	24.6	-	25.3	26.1	+
I-40 WB - KRMC	24.2	24.4	+	19.7	23.5	+	24.5	24.5	
KRMC - Sycamore	21.7	20.8	-	20.7	21.1	+	22.2	20.3	-
Sycamore - Airway	23.8	24.9	+	21.6	26.9	+	20.1	25.2	+
Airway - Kino	23.9	25.2	+	17.2	20.5	+	19.7	15.5	-
Kino - Home Depot	19.8	20.2	+	19.4	14.5	-	14.2	19.6	+
Home Depot - Gordon	24.4	24.4		24.9	24.9		25.1	25.1	
Gordon - Northern	23.3	18.5	-	25	25.6	+	20.3	25.3	+
Corridor	25.4	25.3	-	24.4	25.1	+	24.1	24.9	+

^{*}Segment speed measures include +/- if applicable

Table 5: Evaluation of Traffic Operations Alternatives

	Traffic Operations Alternatives						
Criteria	Signal Optimization	ITS: GPS/Interconnect	ITS: Central System	ITS: Adaptive System	Vehicular Capacity Improvements		
Improvement Cost	\$	\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$\$		
ROW Impact	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair		
Funding Availability	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair		
Safety Impact	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		
Automobile Mobility	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair		
Pedestrian Mobility	Fair	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fair		
Bicycle Mobility	Fair	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poor		
Environmental Impact	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair		
Visual Quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Good		







Access Control Solutions

Table 6: Evaluation of Access Control Solutions Alternative

	Access C	ontrol Solutions Alter	rnative
Criteria	Driveway Closure/Combination	Parcel Thru Access	Raised Medians / Channelization
Improvement Cost	\$	\$\$	\$\$
ROW Impact	Good	Poor	Good
Funding Availability	Good	Poor	Good
Safety Impact	Good	Good	Good
Automobile Mobility	Good	Good	Good
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Good	Good
Bicycle Mobility	Good	Good	Good
Environmental Impact	Fair	Fair	Good
Visual Quality	Fair	Fair	Fair
Public Acceptance	Good	Fair	Good
TAC Support	Good	Good	Good

Beverly Intersection Improvements

Table 7: Evaluation of Beverly Avenue Improvements

Criteria	Beverly Aven	nue Improvements
Citteria	Elongated Roundabout	J-Hook
Improvement Cost	\$\$\$	\$\$
ROW Impact	Poor	Fair
Funding Availability	Poor	Fair
Safety Impact	Fair	Good
Automobile Mobility	Good	Good
Pedestrian Mobility	Poor	Fair
Bicycle Mobility	Poor	Fair
Environmental Impact	Fair	Fair
Visual Quality	Fair	Fair
Public Acceptance	Fair	Fair
TAC Support	Good	Fair

Source: ADOT E2C2 Historical Price Index







Non-motorized Improvements

Table 8: Evaluation of Non-motorized Improvements

	Non-r	motorized Improvemer	nts	
Criteria	Sidewalk Bicycle Lane Addition Addition		Upgrade wide curb Iane	Midblock Crossing
Improvement Cost	\$\$	\$\$\$	\$	\$
ROW Impact	Poor	Poor	Good	Good
Funding Availability	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Safety Impact	Good	Good	Good	Good
Automobile Mobility	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Fair	Fair	Good
Bicycle Mobility	Fair	Good	Good	Fair
Environmental Impact	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Visual Quality	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
Public Acceptance	Good	Fair	Fair	Good
TAC Support	Good	Fair	Fair	Good





Development Framework Alternatives

The evaluation of the Development Framework Alternatives includes Development Policy, Transportation Network Policy, and Multimodal Policy.

Development Policy

Table 9: Evaluation of Development Policy Alternatives – Zoning Ordinance

	Developn	nent Policy Alternatives	s: Zoning Ordina	ınce	
Criteria	Frontage	Setback	Corner Lot	Outparcel	
	Requirements	Requirements	Sizes	Access	
Improvement Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
ROW Impact	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Funding Availability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Safety Impact	Good	Fair	Good	Good	
Automobile	Good	Fair	Good	Good	
Mobility	Good	i dii	Good	Good	
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Fair	Good	Good	
Bicycle Mobility	Good	Fair	Good	Good	
Environmental	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Impact	IN/A	IN/A	IN/A	IV/ A	
Visual Quality	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	
Public Acceptance	Good	Good	Good	Good	
TAC Support	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	

Table 10: Evaluation of Development Policy Alternatives – Development Review

	Development Pol	icy Alternati	ves: Develop	ment Review
Criteria	Optimized	Shared	Shared	Landscape
	Access Design	Access	Parking	Buffers
Improvement Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ROW Impact	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Funding Availability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Safety Impact	Good	Good	Good	Good
Automobile Mobility	Good	Good	Good	Fair
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Good	Good	Fair
Bicycle Mobility	Good	Good	Good	Fair
Environmental Impact	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Visual Quality	Good	Good	Good	Good
Public Acceptance	Good	Good	Good	Good
TAC Support	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair







Transportation Network

Table 11: Evaluation of Transportation Network Alternatives

	Transportation N	Network Alternatives
Criteria	Targeting New Developments	Completing Street Grid (New Streets & Parcel Reassembly)
Improvement Cost	N/A	\$\$\$
ROW Impact	N/A	Poor
Funding Availability	N/A	Fair
Safety Impact	Good	Good
Automobile Mobility	Good	Good
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Good
Bicycle Mobility	Good	Good
Environmental Impact	Fair	Poor
Visual Quality	Fair	Good
Public Acceptance	Good	Poor
TAC Support	Fair	Poor

Multimodal Policy

Table 12: Evaluation of Multimodal Policy Alternatives

		Multimodal Policy Alternatives					
Criteria	Sidewalk Policy	Bicycle Lane Policy	Bicycle Parking Policy	Midblock Crossing Policy	Transit Amenity Policy		
Improvement Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
ROW Impact	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Funding Availability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Safety Impact	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good		
Automobile Mobility	Fair	Fair	Fair	fair	fair		
Pedestrian Mobility	Good	Fair	Fair	Good	Good		
Bicycle Mobility	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Good		
Environmental Impact	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		
Visual Quality	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		
Public Acceptance	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		
TAC Support	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		



